

Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview & Summary Information

Date Investment First Submitted: 2010-09-17
Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-02-29
Investment Auto Submission Date: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Investment Detail Update: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Exhibit 300A Update: 2012-02-29
Date of Last Revision: 2012-06-01

Agency: 023 - General Services Administration **Bureau:** 10 - Supply and Technology Activities

Investment Part Code: 01

Investment Category: 00 - Agency Investments

1. Name of this Investment: Enterprise Acquisition System (EAS)

2. Unique Investment Identifier (Ull): 023-000003319

Section B: Investment Detail

- 1. Provide a brief summary of the investment, including a brief description of the related benefit to the mission delivery and management support areas, and the primary beneficiary(ies) of the investment. Include an explanation of any dependencies between this investment and other investments.**

SPECIFIC BENEFITS AS RELATED TO MISSION Extend Automation of Offer/Modification Capture Process Significant reduction in miscommunications between vendors and contracting staff when processing offers and modifications. Greatly simplify the offer and modification process for industry partners Electronically Capture/Maintain Master Contract Line Item Detail More standard and structured product and service data improve the ability of FAS customers to comparison shop Standardized and structured pricing information improves the efficiency and effectiveness of acquisition professionals analyzing and negotiating vendor pricing proposals Vendors will be able to better position their offers and proposals based on better knowledge of industry pricing for their products and services Significant reduction in non-value add work for scarce acquisition professional resources and more streamlined and user friendly process for FAS stakeholders Provide Automated Workflow for Offer/Modification Processing Significant improvement on productivity for scarce acquisition professionals and reduction in timeline for processing offers, proposals, and modifications Reduced cycle time and consistent experience for vendors Define Enterprise Information Model (Model delivered in FY10) Reduces the need for extensive and costly data mining and transformation efforts that more often than not result in sub-optimal information Helps to ensure that accurate, useful and timely information is available for both internal and external uses, such as competitive and market analysis Provides fact-based

information to support management decision making Supports the improved alignment of FAS offerings with market needs Single-Sign On capabilities Reduces password fatigue from different user name and password combinations Reduces time spent re-entering passwords for the same identify Supports conventional authentication such as Windows credentials (i.e., username/password) PRIMARY BENEFICIARIES OF INVESTMENT Industry Partners FAS 1102 Workforce within Business Portfolios.

2. How does this investment close in part or in whole any identified performance gap in support of the mission delivery and management support areas? Include an assessment of the program impact if this investment isn't fully funded.

EAS is one of several modernization efforts which intends to address the following GSA FAS performance gaps: Gap 1 - The opportunity to leverage business intelligence objectives is lost due to lack of standardization and specificity of contract data, both within and across master contract types. Gap 2 - The ability to effectively manage workload and improve throughput is limited by the lack of process standardization across FAS Gap 3 - The ability to offload administrative work, currently performed by valuable acquisition professionals, and allow staff to concentrate on value added analysis tasks, is limited by lack of workload automation Gap 4 - The lack of enterprise-wide rationalization of FAS products and services, along with program specific development of customer touchpoints (automated and personal), creates unnecessary difficulties for FAS customers and industry partners with FAS Gap 5 - The evolution of systems within FAS where each system has it's individual workflow solution designed to optimize the supported function at the expense of overall end-to-end acquisition effectiveness Gap 6 - The lack of cross-process integration among generally well regarded applications sub-optimizes FAS IT investment Gap 7 - Significant system redundancy Impact if not fully funded: Successful roll-out of EAS Pricing Functionality to all schedules (for both Service and Product schedules) to include quarterly releases of enhancements identified via EAS User Acceptance Testing (with applicable training and communication) is dependent upon Government availability of funds.

3. Provide a list of this investment's accomplishments in the prior year (PY), including projects or useful components/project segments completed, new functionality added, or operational efficiency achieved.

Defined Enterprise Information Model (Model delivered in FY10) Reduces the need for extensive and costly data mining and transformation efforts that more often than not result in sub-optimal information Helps to ensure that accurate, useful and timely information is available for both internal and external uses, such as competitive and market analysis Provides fact-based information to support management decision making Supports the improved alignment of FAS offerings with market needs Requirements completed for the following: Offer/Mod data capture using structured templates at submission Online prompts for accurate/complete data at time of capture Enable multiple structured data file formats (CSV, Excel, EDI, XML) Automatic price comparison for products (offers and mods) Automatic negotiation objective generation (as candidates for Pre-Neg Memo) Semi-automatic Pre-Neg Memo generation Near real-time, online, structured negotiation feature.

4. Provide a list of planned accomplishments for current year (CY) and budget year (BY).

Offer/Mod data capture using structured templates at submission Online prompts for accurate/complete data at time of capture Enable multiple structured data file formats (CSV, Excel, EDI, XML) Automatic price comparison for products (offers and mods) Automatic negotiation objective generation (as candidates for Pre-Neg Memo) Semi-automatic Pre-Neg Memo generation Near real-time, online, structured negotiation feature (Maintains pricing data internal to FAS) Semi-automatic Price-Neg Memo generation Automatic FPR draft generation Structured FPR Automatic FPR / Price-Neg Reconciliation Publication of Pricing / Catalog direct to GSA Advantage! from internal data Automatic generation of Letter of Intent (Mods) Mandatory modification action specific supporting documentation Mod actions split automatically for internal workload management.

5. **Provide the date of the Charter establishing the required Integrated Program Team (IPT) for this investment. An IPT must always include, but is not limited to: a qualified fully-dedicated IT program manager, a contract specialist, an information technology specialist, a security specialist and a business process owner before OMB will approve this program investment budget. IT Program Manager, Business Process Owner and Contract Specialist must be Government Employees.**

2010-07-15

Section C: Summary of Funding (Budget Authority for Capital Assets)

1.

Table I.C.1 Summary of Funding

	PY-1 & Prior	PY 2011	CY 2012	BY 2013
Planning Costs:	\$5.0	\$7.0	\$5.1	\$5.3
DME (Excluding Planning) Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
DME (Including Planning) Govt. FTEs:	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2
Sub-Total DME (Including Govt. FTE):	\$5.2	\$7.2	\$5.3	\$5.5
O & M Costs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
O & M Govt. FTEs:	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0	\$0.0
Sub-Total O & M Costs (Including Govt. FTE):	0	0	0	0
Total Cost (Including Govt. FTE):	\$5.2	\$7.2	\$5.3	\$5.5
Total Govt. FTE costs:	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2	\$0.2
# of FTE rep by costs:	1	2	2	2
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (\$)		\$0.1	\$1.7	
Total change from prior year final President's Budget (%)		1.90%	48.30%	

2. If the funding levels have changed from the FY 2012 President's Budget request for PY or CY, briefly explain those changes:

This is a new investment and there have been no changes.

Section D: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

Table I.D.1 Contracts and Acquisition Strategy

Contract Type	EVM Required	Contracting Agency ID	Procurement Instrument Identifier (PIID)	Indefinite Delivery Vehicle (IDV) Reference ID	IDV Agency ID	Solicitation ID	Ultimate Contract Value (\$M)	Type	PBSA ?	Effective Date	Actual or Expected End Date
Awarded	4730	GS35F0400J	NA	4730							

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

Exhibit 300B: Performance Measurement Report

Section A: General Information

Date of Last Change to Activities: 2012-02-29

Section B: Project Execution Data

Table II.B.1 Projects

Project ID	Project Name	Project Description	Project Start Date	Project Completion Date	Project Lifecycle Cost (\$M)
2012-0002	FY12 DME: Service Schedules	For FY12, the project scope will focus solely on the EAS Pricing Solution, with a planned Pilot for October 2011(as noted above) and targeted roll-out to remaining Service Schedules (13 additional Service Schedules) of end-to-end electronic workflow for pricing capture, evaluation, negotiation and award for MAS Offers/Mods. FY12 scope will include enhancement releases as identified in previous UAT sessions.			
2012-0003	FY12 DME: EAS Product Schedules - Iteration 1	FY12 scope will also include activities around MAS Offers/Mods for Product Schedules to include related architecture, development and testing activities in order to further assess Business/ Production Readiness, with planned Pilot for Product Schedules in FY12.			

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
------------	------	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

Activity Summary

Roll-up of Information Provided in Lowest Level Child Activities

Project ID	Name	Total Cost of Project Activities (\$M)	End Point Schedule Variance (in days)	End Point Schedule Variance (%)	Cost Variance (\$M)	Cost Variance (%)	Total Planned Cost (\$M)	Count of Activities
------------	------	--	---------------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------------------	---------------------

2012-0002 FY12 DME: Service Schedules

2012-0003 FY12 DME: EAS Product Schedules - Iteration 1

Key Deliverables

Project Name	Activity Name	Description	Planned Completion Date	Projected Completion Date	Actual Completion Date	Duration (in days)	Schedule Variance (in days)	Schedule Variance (%)
2012-0002	Services Pilot support and Planning	Upfront planning and support providing helpdesk support, communications, training for services pilot rollout	2012-02-29	2012-02-29		151	-184	-121.85%
2012-0002	Product Schedules Prototype - Iteration 1 - Design	Completion of Requirements, Design for Pricing Data Upload & Submission and CO/CS assignment workflow - Iteration 1	2012-05-18	2012-05-18		200	-105	-52.50%
2012-0002	Product Schedules Prototype - Iteration 1 - Development	Completion of Development for Pricing Data Upload & Submission and CO/CS assignment workflow - Iteration 1	2012-07-11	2012-07-11		189	-51	-26.98%

Section C: Operational Data

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Increase the amount of re-use (code) as a percentage of total system that is being used for cost reduction?	Percent (of total) of reuse code leading to cost r	Technology - Efficiency	Over target	50.000000	60.000000	66.000000	70.000000	Quarterly
Non-standardized configurations items converted to be standardized EA configuration	Number of Non-standardized configurations items co	Technology - Information and Data	Over target	6.000000	6.000000	6.000000	6.000000	Quarterly
Initial pass rate for user acceptance test	First Pass Yield Rate	Customer Results - Customer Benefit	Over target	21.000000	0.000000	5.000000	0.000000	Monthly
Business Process capturing as process models for business process automation and agility	Percentage of automated business processes relativ	Mission and Business Results - Management of Government Resources	Over target	66.000000	100.000000	66.000000	100.000000	Quarterly
Minimize requirements churn to obviate the introduction of requirements defects which are a core cause of excessive cost and schedule variances.	New Requirements, Modified Requirements, Deleted R	Process and Activities - Productivity	Over target	550.000000	5.000000	17.100000	5.000000	Monthly
Establish a zero critical defect rate for all baselines released into Production.	Production Defects	Technology - Efficiency	Under target	5.000000	0.000000	0.000000	5.000000	Quarterly
Establish a 90% Pass threshold for Test Cases Executed and Passed per month.	Test cases executed and Passed per month	Technology - Quality Assurance	Over target	90.000000	0.000000	98.000000	90.000000	Monthly
Percent of Test	Test Cases Planned	Technology -	Over target	90.000000	0.000000	0.000000	90.000000	Monthly

Table II.C.1 Performance Metrics

Metric Description	Unit of Measure	FEA Performance Measurement Category Mapping	Measurement Condition	Baseline	Target for PY	Actual for PY	Target for CY	Reporting Frequency
Cases planned for execution vs Actually executed: Establish a 90% percent threshold for Test Cases Planned and Executed per month	and Executed per month	Efficiency						
Contracting Officers / Contracting Specialists Training Impact: - GOAL 60% of the CO/CSs for each schedule rollout is maintained.	Number of CO/CS's trained for each rollout	Technology - Efficiency	Over target	60.000000	0.000000	0.000000	60.000000	Monthly
Acquisition Solicitation Impact: GOAL No Award / Mod delayed longer than 30 days resulting from a Pricing Evaluation Tool (PET) defect.	Days	Customer Results - Timeliness and Responsiveness	Under target	30.000000	0.000000	0.000000	30.000000	Monthly
Service Schedules Rollout Adoption: GOAL 20% of Vendors trained on New Offers / Mods received within 30 days of rollout.	Vendors & Days	Process and Activities - Cycle Time and Timeliness	Over target	20.000000	0.000000	0.000000	20.000000	Monthly